

Remarks

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the interview on July 11, 2005. It was discussed during the interview that none of the references of record describe or suggest a lubricant coat comprising an acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax, let alone such a lubricant coat applied to a stainless steel sheet having the claimed composition. As discussed, this combination is novel and non-obvious over the prior art known to the Applicants. A more detailed discussion of the references cited and the reasons Claims 3 and 4 are patentable thereover follows.

The Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 4 to correct minor typographical errors.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over EP '206, EP '084, Kato, EP '375 or Sato hypothetically combined with Moyle or Omosako. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's specific comments concerning the locations of portions of the primary and secondary references that are applied against the claims. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not make the hypothetical combination but, in any event, even if the hypothetical combination were to be made, the resulting ferritic stainless steel sheet of such a combination would still fail to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Claims 3 and 4.

Starting with EP '375, the Applicants note that the ferritic stainless steel in EP '375 has proven to be highly successful with respect to the deep drawability and anti-ridging properties contained therein. However, there is utterly no application of the steels of EP '375 to Claims 3 and 4. As frankly acknowledged in the Official Action, EP '375 fails to teach or suggest a coating comprising an acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax. In fact, EP '375 fails to disclose any coating at all, much less the specifically claimed coating of Claims 3 and 4 in the specifically claimed amount.

Kato is essentially the same as EP '375 in its utter failure to disclose lubricants or lubricant coatings of any kind, much less the specifically claimed coating in the specifically claimed quantity. As a consequence, Kato is inapplicable to both of Claims 3 and 4.

Sato is the same as EP '375 and Kato with respect to the fact that it too utterly fails to disclose, teach or suggest lubricants of any type, much less the claimed lubricant in the claimed amount.

Both of Moyle and Omosako are cited to make up for the lack of disclosure in all of EP '084, EP '206, Kato, EP '375 and Sato. This is, however, problematic, inasmuch as both of Moyle and Omosako also fail to disclose, teach or suggest a lubricant comprising acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax. For example, Moyle discloses a coating which is intended to protect against corrosion. Of course, this is sharply different than the Applicants' bake-coated lubricant coat that is intended to facilitate deep drawing, among other things. In any event, the coating disclosed by Moyle is an epoxy resin, chromium trioxide and water. This has nothing to do with a lubricant comprising an acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax as recited in Claims 3 and 4.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not make the hypothetical combination in the first place and, even if the combination were to be made, the resulting steel sheet would still fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 3 and 4. Specifically, Moyle discloses a coating to protect against corrosion. That is not the Applicants' reason for applying for bake-coating the lubricant and is also not a reason set forth in any of EP '206, EP '084, Kato, EP '375 and Sato. For example, and as noted above, EP '084 does not mention lubricants at all. Also, to the extent that the Applicants were trying to provide a lubricant to facilitate drawing, EP '084 provides utterly no help at all on this point and neither does Moyle. The Moyle lubricant is specifically stated for protection against corrosion, not for facilitation of deep drawing.

Omosako also goes in a completely different direction from the subject matter of Claims 3 and 4 and from the primary references. Omosako discloses a lubricant which comprises a thickener and iron hydroxide powder. The thickener can be cellulose ether or polyacrylic acids. The lubricant of Omosako is intended to protect against roll scoring which, again, has nothing to do with the subject matter of Claims 3 and 4 and, importantly, has nothing to do with the primary references. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to look to Omosako when attempting to provide a lubricant that facilitates deep drawing. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine either of the second references with either of the primary references. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination must fail on that basis alone.


Nonetheless, there are further compelling reasons as to why the rejection must fail. As noted above, Moyle discloses a coating comprising epoxy resin, chromium trioxide and water. Omosako discloses a lubricant comprising a thickener and iron hydroxide powder. Accordingly, both of the secondary references utterly fail to disclose, teach or suggest acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax as recited in Claims 3 and 4. As a consequence, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to combine either of the secondary references with either of the primary references, the resulting steel sheet would have a lubricant that comprises either a thickener and iron hydroxide powder or epoxy resin, chromium trioxide and water. Neither of those lubricants comprises acrylic resin, calcium stearate and polyethylene wax. The Applicants accordingly respectfully submit that the secondary references are non-enabling with respect to lubricants as recited in Claims 3 and 4. They are just completely different lubricants and, even if combined with the primary references, result in a steel sheet that has nothing to do with the subject matter of Claims 3 and 4.

Moreover, the Applicants' claims recite that the lubricant is a bake-coated lubricant. There is

utterly no disclosure in any of the four references as to bake-coated lubricants. Thus, hypothetically combining either secondary reference with the primary references would still fail to teach or suggest a bake-coated lubricant. The Applicants accordingly respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750

TDC:vb
(215) 656-3381